



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/597,763

08/07/2006

Romhild Martijn Hoogeveen

PHNL040124US

5886

38107

7590

02/19/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
595 MINER ROAD
CLEVELAND, OH 44143

EXAMINER

FETZNER, TIFFANY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2831

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/19/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/597,763	Applicant(s) HOOGEVEEN, ROMHILD MARTIJN	
	Examiner Tiffany A. Fetzner	Art Unit 2831	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(3) _____.

(2) Attorney Thomas E. Kocovshy Jr reg No. 28,383.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 February 2009

Time: 2 p.m.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

The applied prior art of record, the problems raised by the applicants amended claim language, and how based on the amended limitations the prior art of US patent 6,529,004 issued to Young et al., is applicable to the currently amended claims, and why applicants over generality in setting forth the amended claim language of the instant application, sales to distinguish it from known prior arts of record. The examiner also noted that the applicants currently amended claim language, makes the novelty which applicant seeks to set forth ambiguous to the examiner, in this instant application, since what appears to be the recited novelty has already been established and performed by the prior art of record. The examiner notes if applicant is attempting to expand what has previously been known and performed by the prior art of record, then that new novel component which expands what is already known is seemingly missing from the currently amended claim limitations, as they are currently set forth by the applicant..

Claims discussed:

Claims 3-11, and new claim 13.

Prior art documents discussed:

See Continuation Sheet

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The Examiner contacted applicants representative in an attempt to clarify and resolve the concerns raised by applicants. November 12, 2008 amendment and response respect to appropriate frame of reference, grammar, and the fact that the feature argued by applicant as the point of novelty is not present in each and every one of applicants currently amended independent claims. The the novelty and claim issues raised by the applicant's amendment and response could not be resolved at the time of the examiners telephonic interview. Therefore, the applicant was informed that a final office action necessitated by amendment would be forthcoming by the Examiner. The applicants representative thanked the Examiner for her time, in attempting to resolve and clarify the issues in the instant application in order to further prosecution, but also noted that the issues and concerns raised by the Examiner still remained unresolved at the end of the telephonic interview, and that applicant would await the examiners' Final office action, necessitated by applicant's amendments in the November 12, 2008 response in order to assure that all remaining issues could be addressed by applicant fully in their next follow-up response to the examiners current office action.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview since the interview

/T. A. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2831
571-272-2241

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: Young US patent 6,529,004 B1 issued March 4, 2003 file June 5, 2000; Yasukhara et al., US patent 7,218,106 issued May 15, 2007 filed September 28, 2004 and its Japanese priority documents of 12/4/2003-405779 and 2/19/2004-042863. The examiner notes, the applicant effective priority date is February 9, 2004 which falls between the two noted Japanese priority documents. The examiner notes that the Young reference however, is prior art, regardless, since it's filing date is June 5, 2000. .